

AD-A119 475

RAND CORP SANTA MONICA CA  
CONFLICT AMONG TESTING PROCEDURES?(U)  
APR 82 D F KOHLER  
RAND/P-6765

F/G 12/1

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

1 of 1  
Pages



END  
DATE  
FILMED  
10-82  
DTIC

AD A119475

CONFLICT AMONG TESTING PROCEDURES?

Daniel F. Kohler

April 1982

DTIC  
SELECTED  
SEP 22 1982  
H

DTIC FILE COPY

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

P-6765

82 09 22 068

### **The Rand Paper Series**

Papers are issued by The Rand Corporation as a service to its professional staff. Their purpose is to facilitate the exchange of ideas among those who share the author's research interests; Papers are not reports prepared in fulfillment of Rand's contracts or grants. Views expressed in a Paper are the author's own, and are not necessarily shared by Rand or its research sponsors.

The Rand Corporation  
Santa Monica, California 90406

CONFLICT AMONG TESTING PROCEDURES?

Daniel F. Kohler

April 1982

## CONFLICT AMONG TESTING PROCEDURES?

### 1. Introduction

Savin [1976] and Berndt and Savin [1977], among others, have pointed out that an inequality relation exists between the Lagrange Multiplier Test (LM), the Wald Test (W), and the Likelihood Ratio Test (LR). However, since all tests converge to the same limiting Chi-square distribution they are usually compared against the same critical value. This raises the possibility of conflicting conclusions from the three tests.

Kohler [1979] and Vandaele [1981] have shown that the three tests are monotonic functions of each other. This implies that they have identical power characteristics. In particular, if the probabilities of Type I errors are equal among the three tests, they have to have the same probability of Type II errors as well. In essence we are dealing with one and the same test.

In this paper we review briefly how the tests are related and why the inequality relation exists. We then derive criteria which allow us to determine which test is more appropriate in a given situation. This should resolve possible conflicts for at least some sets of circumstances.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

## 2. The Three Tests and the Inequality Among Them

Consider the model:

$$(1) \quad Y = X\beta + \epsilon$$

$$(2) \quad \epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I) \quad .$$

Let  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  be the maximum-likelihood estimators obtained by unconstrained maximization of the likelihood function, and  $\tilde{\beta}$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}^2$  the corresponding estimators obtained by maximizing the likelihood function subject to the constraint  $R\tilde{\beta} = r$ . Furthermore, we shall need an estimator for the Lagrange multiplier ( $\hat{\mu}$ ) and the ratio of the constrained to unconstrained maxima of the likelihood function ( $\lambda$ ). The three test statistics can be written as:

$$(3) \quad LR = -2 \log \lambda$$

$$(4) \quad W = [(\tau - R\hat{\beta})'(R(X'X)^{-1}R')^{-1}(\tau - R\hat{\beta})]/\hat{\sigma}^2$$

$$(5) \quad LM = [\hat{\mu}(R(X'X)^{-1}R')\hat{\mu}]/\tilde{\sigma}^2 \quad .$$

To simplify the notation let  $A = R(\frac{1}{n} X'X)^{-1}R'$ . From the first-order conditions for maximizing the likelihood function subject to the constraint we can obtain an expression for  $\hat{\mu}$ :

$$(6) \quad \hat{\mu} = (R(X'X)^{-1}R')^{-1}(\tau - R\hat{\beta}) \quad .$$

We can now rewrite Eqs. (4) and (5) as

$$(7) \quad W = n[(r - R\hat{\beta})'A^{-1}(r - R\hat{\beta})]/\hat{\sigma}^2$$

$$(8) \quad LM = n[(r - R\hat{\beta})'A^{-1}(r - R\hat{\beta})]/\tilde{\sigma}^2 \quad .$$

Recall that  $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \hat{\sigma}^2 + (r - R\hat{\beta})'A^{-1}(r - R\hat{\beta})$  and  $\lambda = (\tilde{\sigma}^2/\hat{\sigma}^2)^{-n/2}$ . Adopting the shorthand notation  $\theta$  for  $\tilde{\sigma}^2/\hat{\sigma}^2$  we can rewrite the three tests as:

$$(9) \quad LR = n \cdot \log(\theta)$$

$$(10) \quad W = n \cdot (\theta - 1)$$

$$(11) \quad LM = n \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{\theta}) \quad .$$

Given that  $\theta \geq 1$  with probability 1 this establishes the inequality

$$(12) \quad LM \leq LR \leq W \quad .$$

### 3. Which Tests Should Be Used?

Equations (9) through (11) allow us to express any one of the three tests as a function of any other. Furthermore, we can transform the  $W$  statistic into an  $F$  statistic by a standard degrees of freedom adjustment. Thus for small samples we can express any one of the three tests as a transformation of an  $F$  test for which exact critical values can be calculated.

However, few researchers go through all that trouble. Most commonly, the value of the test statistic is simply compared to the critical value  $c$  obtained from a standard Chi-square table. This is the source of possible conflicts since the three tests differ numerically but are compared against the same critical value.

Let  $c_\alpha$  be the  $\alpha$  percent critical value of the Chi-square distribution, i.e.,  $\Pr\{\chi^2 > c_\alpha\} = \alpha$ . We can now calculate the probability of a Type I error for any one of the tests. In particular we have:

$$(13) \quad P_I(W) = \Pr(W > c_\alpha)$$

$$(14) \quad P_I(LM) = \Pr(LM > c_\alpha) \quad .$$

By expressing  $LM$  as a function of  $W$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} (15) \quad P_I(LM) &= \Pr\left(W \left(\frac{1}{1 + W/n}\right) > c_\alpha\right) \\ &= \Pr(W(1 - c_\alpha/n) > c_\alpha) \\ &= \Pr\left(W > c_\alpha \cdot \left[\frac{1}{1 - c_\alpha/n}\right]\right) < P_I(W) \quad . \end{aligned}$$



We can also establish that  $P_I(W) > \alpha$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 (16) \quad P_I(W) &= \Pr\{W > c_\alpha\} \\
 &= \Pr\{F \cdot q\left(\frac{1}{1 - k/n}\right) > c_\alpha\} \\
 &= \Pr\{F > \frac{c_\alpha}{q} (1 - k/n)\} > \alpha .
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $c_\alpha/q$  is less than or equal to the critical value of an F distribution for the same level of significance, and  $(1 - k/n) < 1$ ,  $P_I(W)$  must be larger than  $\alpha$ . By combining Eqs. (15) and (16) we can compare  $P_I(LM)$  to  $\alpha$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 (17) \quad P_I(LM) &= \Pr\{W > c_\alpha \left[\frac{1}{1 - c_\alpha/n}\right]\} \\
 &= \Pr\{F \cdot q\left(\frac{1}{1 - k/n}\right) > c_\alpha \left[\frac{1}{1 - c_\alpha/n}\right]\} \\
 &= \Pr\{F > \frac{c_\alpha}{q} \left[\frac{1 - k/n}{1 - c_\alpha/n}\right]\} .
 \end{aligned}$$

If the bracketed expression in Eq. (17) is less than or equal to one,  $P_I(LM)$  is larger than  $\alpha$ . In other words, if  $c_\alpha \geq k$ , we have the relationship

$$(18) \quad P_I(W) > P_I(LM) > \alpha \quad | \quad c_\alpha \geq k .$$

The interesting part about this relationship is that it depends not only on  $q$  and  $k$ , but also on the level of significance chosen. If we are estimating five parameters with one constraint, we get the critical values  $c_{\alpha_1} = 3.841$  for  $\alpha_1 = .05$ , and  $c_{\alpha_2} = 6.635$  for  $\alpha_2 = .01$ . From Eq. (18) we can determine that at significance level  $\alpha_2$ , the LM

test is certainly the more accurate test, i.e.,  $P_I(LM)$  is closer to the postulated value of  $\alpha_2$  than  $P_I(W)$ . For significance level  $\alpha_1$  the question is open, and depends on the difference between  $c_\alpha/q$  and the corresponding critical value for the F distribution which in turn depends on the sample size.

#### 4. Conclusions

We have shown that the well known inequality relation between the LM, W and LR tests does not need to lead to conflicting results. Since the tests are monotonic functions of each other, as well as of the familiar F test, we can calculate the precise critical values that will equate the probability of a Type I error for all three tests. Under these circumstances, the three tests will have exactly the same probability of rejection and identical power. Conflicting results are impossible.

If we use the same critical value for the three tests, i.e.,  $c_\alpha$  obtained from the Chi-square distribution towards which all three tests converge, conflicts are possible. However, under certain circumstances we can show that  $P_I(LM)$  is closer to  $\alpha$  than  $P_I(W)$ , and by inference  $P_I(LR)$  which is situated between  $P_I(W)$  and  $P_I(LM)$ , which should lead us to prefer the LM test since it is more accurate, i.e., its probability of rejection is closer to the postulated value  $\alpha$ .

#### REFERENCES

- Berndt, E. and Savin, N. E. (1977), "Conflict Among Criteria for Testing Hypothesis in the Multivariate Linear Regression Model," Econometrica, 45, 1263-1278
- Kohler, D. F., "Conflict Among Testing Procedures in a Linear Regression Model," Wayne Economic Papers No. 81, Wayne State University, Detroit, 1979
- Savin, N. E. (1976), "Conflict Among Testing Procedures in a Linear Regression Model With Autoregressive Disturbances," Econometrica, 44, 1303-1315
- Vandaele, W., "Wald, Likelihood Ratio, and the Lagrange Multiplier Tests as an F Test," Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper No. 866, December 1981

FILME  
10-8